



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/545,689	04/07/2000	Richard John Blasiak	RAL9000022	2096

47052 7590 10/07/2004

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP
PO BOX 51418
PALO ALTO, CA 94303

EXAMINER

ZHEN, LI B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/545,689

Applicant(s)

BLASIAK ET AL.

Examiner

Li B. Zhen

Art Unit

2126

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 23 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.Claim(s) objected to: none.Claim(s) rejected: 1-10.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

MENG-AN T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

Applicant argues, (1) the jump table of Yarvin is different from the reserved address of the present invention, because the jump table requires execution stacks (i.e., memory) to be allocated for each client [p. 4, line 22 - p. 5, line 2] (2) the reserved address of the present invention eliminates the need for jump table and this is beneficial because the jump table requires pre-allocated memory space and other sources to regularly update the jump table's index [p. 5, lines 2 - 5] and (3) Yarvin states that the "caller knows the address of the callee's text" and this teaches away from the present invention where the instruction address is not known to the remote procedure call requestor [p. 5, lines 10 - 13].

As to argument (1), examiner respectfully disagrees and notes that the claims do not preclude the examiner from mapping a jump table to a reserved address. Examiner interprets the limitation "reserved address" as a portion of memory that is reserved at a specific address. Since a jump table is also pre-allocated memory space at a specific location, Yarvin's jump table would read on applicant's reserved address.

In response to argument (2), it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., see argument (2) above) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.

As to argument (3), examiner respectfully disagrees because the examiner mapped Yarvin's "entry point in the callee's code" to the applicant's instruction address [see previous rejection] and Yarvin teaches preserving anonymity, managing control data flow without revealing either party's address to each other, and not giving the caller the actual entry point in the callee's code [Section 3.1, p. 4].